

**EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**April 1, 2002**

**Members attending:** Richard King, Amy Simpson, Bob Liedich, Stu Greenberg, Mike Suver, Paige Akins, Emily Lee, Fred Starheim, Mary Smith, Kevin Snape, Laura Hobson, Kathleen Gaiser, Tim Nieberding, Bill Davis, Anjali Mathur, Doug Broussard, Bill Skowronski, Glenn Landers

**Members Absent:** Virginia Aveni, Rev. Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domnivic, Eleanor Bycoski, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Elizabeth Shaw, Dennis Finn

**Facilitators:** Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman

The Ohio Air Toxics Group convened for the ninth time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. The facilitators reviewed the agenda and noted that they would prepare the meeting summary.

**Review February Meeting Summary** – The facilitators reviewed the status of the February meeting summary. The Working Group had no questions or concerns and the summary was approved.

**Updates:**

- **Commuter Choice Program** (Transportation Committee), RTA reported on a brief meeting preceding the group meeting, where NOACA made a short presentation. The Mayor has agreed to send letters to employers the group identifies, to encourage them to work on the Commuter Advantage Program. It entails meeting with businesses first, and doing some car pool planning. RTA encourages employers to be the sales agents. Employees pay upfront and then get some tax benefits, as do the employers. RTA has this program operative with about 100 employers (6000 passes every month currently). The list given to NOACA came from a Harris database search for Slavic Village. NOACA will sort through that list and follow up with personal calls. Members are encouraged to contribute other names to be added to the list.
- **Logo:** money was approved to pay for its design. The subcommittee (George, Emily, Bill and Mary) obtained 3 designs for approval (the ultimate decision is EPA's). The logo will be used for brochures such as Earthfest. The group was asked to comment. Emily presented the 3 designs in black and white and in color. The subcommittee agreed to consider comments about colors and will strive for something that catches the eye and has the rectangular shape. A group "sense" was requested (no EPA members voting): logo 1 – 16 for; logo 2 – 0 for; logo 3 – 0 for. The subcommittee will work on refining and taking into account suggestions.

**Refresher on preliminary list of air toxics for risk reduction consideration**

Last July, EPA had funded initial inventory of toxics from what was available. The report, called the ICF report, identified some twenty toxics that are of highest concern given existing data. EPA reminded the group that there are limitations to the data used. They include: some toxics are missing from some analysis, some are dated, with implications in terms of estimates in

modeling and emissions estimates, monitoring is not fully comprehensive, hazard information may be conservative in face of uncertainty, and, for some pollutants we may know more about hazards, but not emissions, and vice versa. Bottom line of analysis, according to the presenter, is that the weight of evidence points to this list. It is useful to conclude that this group of twenty some toxics is the same/comparable roughly in terms of risk. The analogy allowed us to step away from the forest, and identify the “big trees.” Thus, the presenter suggested, the group may want to think about additional criteria in terms of projected reductions, feasibility, ease of implementation, etc., when selecting projects.

#### Discussion:

Q: What are the sources of toxics? A: Some toxics have primarily indoor sources such as dieldrin (indoor pesticide used for termites); benzene is split -- some comes from outdoor and some from indoor; carbon tetrachloride is mostly outdoor, an industrial pollutant. On the outdoor side, there are sources from mobile to stationary, area and major, on- and off- road.

Q: for the national scale, is there exposure modeling? A: Emissions information, in the ICF report, talked about exposure modeling too. Part of that report addresses what are the big pollutants. For the exposure modeling a draft was used as of last summer. This is a recap of what was presented last July. It was noted by a member that the recap is very helpful for citizens at large – good for web site and hard copy, much better summary of ICF, more understandable, and readable.

Q: Should you focus less on major stationary sources? A: major stationary sources don't seem to be the major source due to existing control and regulatory programs, but the thinking at EPA is to look at smaller sources. A lot has been done in the last ten years for big major sources. This is for the County as a whole, averaged over County. It was noted that the group has to figure out how to put a value on localized effects when weighing projects against one another: emissions and exposures vary block-to-block, so hard to go to too detailed of scale. On average, over the county, big stationary sources may not be the greatest source.

Q: Major sources have a narrower definition – not all are factory point sources, right? A: It is the biggest industry and power plants, thresholds – Title V equals large sources. Title V may be criteria pollutants. These are considered the major, stationary sources. Area sources could be “smaller” but many of them are higher emitters of air toxics.

Q: If there are both outdoor and indoor sources, is there greater exposure for one? A: One thing to think about is that there is a basket of things, with the weight of evidence from different data bases/analysis. ICF did a good job, pulling out some pollutants broadly, which are probably a problem. If you pick a project with any of these you cannot go wrong. We won't know ever the exact risks. Given limitations in terms of time and information, this is a good list: reduce any of these, and it will be good for neighborhood and city.

Q: One should also consider that the city versus the county gets more exposure? A: You have people exposed throughout county to indoor chemicals if ubiquitous, but depending where they live, they will have added exposure. Small polluters maybe adding that much more pollution. A

limitation of the ICF report is its gross, not refined scale. A: it is still useful information to take action – this can tell us something.

Q: Take away the top dirty dozen: can we come up with voluntary programs that will maximize amounts of reductions we can achieve with the money we have? A: Outdoor estimates rely on emissions inventories; indoor estimates rely on monitoring data, what you learn about microenvironments. For indoor sources, things are not as clearly categorized.

Q: For stationary sources is it possible to rank by risk? A: the problem is comparing apples to oranges – we need same type of information, comparable levels of uncertainty, but don't have this to do comparative risk across toxics and sources. We do know some are Class A carcinogens, proven in humans, versus B, which are suspected, and so forth. If we look at something gross like that, relative ranking is possible. But different kinds of information stand behind each toxic and data sources, so we keep coming back to the same rough category of concern – the best conclusion we can draw from the information we have.

Q: This risk driver list helps us to focus. One concern: some toxics like mercury and dioxin that are not going to show up on TRI. A: Mercury and dioxin are not on the list, because the exposure of concern is not likely by air pathway. Environmental tobacco smoke and benzene are also highly toxic. Should we add some pollutants not currently listed? We could, but once again, we can't go wrong by reducing any of these pollutants.

Q: All pollutants show up because of TRI, and many other analyses too. Are we missing other key ones? A: There are going to be some pollutants that are missing, but can't say what we're missing.

**Subcommittee Reports:** As the discussion began, the facilitators noted that the Working Group needs to think about shifting from making decisions on which projects to spend money, to project implementation teams – for the projects selected, to have point people that can make the project happen. Each subcommittee then presented a brief overview of their current work.

*Business subcommittee:* The list of projects includes identifying what is going on in the neighborhood and countywide. We are looking at the toxics inventory and at neighborhoods that have specific concerns. We used the Harris database and identified electroplaters and auto body shops as key area emitters and are now looking at pollution prevention programs. We looked at good neighbor agreements and at overlaps with the transportation committee – anti-idling diesel equipment and retrofit for buses and trucks that neighborhoods are concerned about. We looked at idling patterns in neighborhoods and commuter choice programs. We're also considering dry cleaners and small business grants and awards program to include 100 businesses to encourage them to reduce toxics by distributing grants for projects they are willing to undertake. We talked about raising additional dollars to sustain projects. We will continue to meet (next Monday) to determine which projects are viable based on the criteria.

*Transportation:* We have two projects ready: low-sulfur diesel fuel to be kicked off by April 30 or May 1–2, after we resolved some issues involving the availability of the fuel (the price was

initially higher than we thought when we proposed the project). We need input and assistance to put together an event with the mayor, EPA, BP, April 30 May 1 or 2: a ribbon-cutting event. We'll get some logos made up for the buses as soon as available.

*Gas Cans:* In addition, we are trying to implement the gas can project and are looking for group resources to help. The scale for what we can do is proportional to the community help we can get. We need some logistical decisions for the trade-in program. We require some staff for collection (to empty any drops left in the old cans) and to find out where we can conduct more exchanges than just those we can do at the household hazardous waste collection day for homes. We would like a separate event from the homes collection but we need more assistance. We are looking for other groups to target. We need help to make it happen. Volunteers agreed to meet with the Cleveland EPA office to strategize about how to proceed.

*Idling:* big concern in the neighborhoods and with the school buses. We want to get people to turn their engines off. In the TOOLS FOR SCHOOLS (TFS) training, we introduced a mobile source component in the training, for the first time (piloted here in Cleveland, to be added nationally). We are also thinking of a citywide campaign, multi-media, news, internet, and spokespeople in the community to help reduce idling.

*Diesel retrofits:* focusing on middle-aged vehicles that are going to stay in the fleet for many more years (but not the oldest ones, which should be replaced soon). It would be good to go out in the community and create a competition seeking proposals from fleets in the community to see who can come up with the best or most sustainable projects, beyond what we can do with schools. We are trying to get the diesel from off-road sources reduced (construction sites). We need to get you information about it but one way is a longer-term effort to build into contracts for the city (airports, etc) has to commit to using the cleanest engines. Short term: the big fleets in the community should use a lower sulfur, highway diesel fuel. That would give a 10% reduction just from changing fuel. One member noted that the airport expansion project is already using this kind of approach.

*Home:* We focused on the household hazardous waste campaign. We have been working on logistics so we would have to pay less by getting sponsors. We wanted to pilot and repeat in other neighborhoods. We won't have anything put together for the long-term until we see how it works at the end of May. We wanted to propose projects at the end of May or June. We want to work on longer-range education campaigns. One additional idea is doing lot research to put together a curriculum on indoor-outdoor pollution for middle school kids. We also want to do a staff education training component. We want to educate families through the staff education and children's education. We want to get greener products in the schools through suppliers already working in the schools. In addition, we did our TFS projects and want to do it for all schools in the neighborhoods. The ones who did it can become mentors. We talked about a native landscaping project. As well.

**Criteria:** The facilitators noted that there will be approximately 20 projects from the subcommittees. In our next meetings we need to hear why they were recommended. Then we have the criteria to weigh the projects against. The business subcommittee weighted the criteria and we tallied and gave each project a ranking (simple –1 to 3 for example) and then we multiplied the grade by the weight to come up with a project score. It was noted that the weightings are not the end all, but can serve to help inform and focus the discussion about trade-offs.

#### Discussion:

Group members made the following points.

#### *Cross-committee projects*

- Some issues arising in one subcommittee could apply to other subcommittees, such as green products (schools and businesses) and should not be pigeonholed into one or another subcommittee. We should take advantage of synergies across projects, but we won't know until we start talking about it.
- It's helpful to talk about projects together, maybe in two consecutive evenings. It would also help to go into the meeting having read something about the project. We should not be hearing about a project for the first time during the meeting. We could read through and formulate questions beforehand.

▪

#### *Ripeness of projects*

- Some projects the business and transportation committees are working on are short-term—we identified a fleet or community and how to get it done. The next step is how to get beyond these specific projects. Should we come up with longer-term projects less well defined but replicating the same efforts in other communities or with other fleets? Should we have specific tangible projects only or also some longer-term ones? Concerns: figuring out how to implement and how to push forward some ideas that might be good in the longer term.
- Some things are more developed and some are less and need more time because they are good ideas and should not be thrown out. There should not be a lot of proposals but those that are good ideas we don't want to lose. Don't overwhelm but don't lose ideas.
- All serious proposals should be on the table even if not completely developed -- look at the whole. We need to think of priorities and allocation. That will also help think of other possible sources of funding and making things sustainable. As the ideas switch to implementation it's difficult to know when implementation will be done and what problems will arise.

#### *Strategies*

- We need to make the decisions on funding – maybe we need to add people to committees and meet more often until the next group meeting. We need to make some hard decisions strategically and smartly. Should we meet more frequently or delay the timeline?
- 2 options – get everything on the table by April 29 and we'll keep adjusting as we go and the deadline might extend; or we could say we need 2 more months to finish the work and have 2 meeting nights in May to finish the job and get all projects on the table.

- The first option is preferable, to see what everyone else is doing. We talk a lot about money but our limiting factor might end up being time and trust. If nobody wants to spend time in implementing it's an indication that a project is not worth pursuing
- In the next meeting we should get as much as we can even if it's not polished. We will focus on getting as many specific projects out on the table and that will be the majority of the meeting next time.

#### **Outreach and Other:**

- Others who will do presentations over the next month are Bill S., to Lorain Leadership. Bill L. will present at Research Triangle Park.
- Earthfest volunteers, Sunday 21: Paige; Kevin, Rev. Smith, Sanda; Anjali's draft brochure; -- email comments to Pat by the end of the week noon (maybe Mary's office can finish it up).
- EPA going to a Portland conference
- RFP deadline for hosting the project monies -- April 26.
- Next meeting April 29. Then May 28.

#### **Adjournment**

The group adjourned at 9:15 PM.